IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVAIA

JOHN SHIKO 3987 Upper Road Shamokin, PA 17872	: : CIVIL ACTION
Plaintiff,	: : No.:
v. MAURER & SCOTT, INC. d/b/a Maurer & Scott Sales, Inc. 122 Thomas Street Coopersburg, PA 18036	JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
Defendant.	; ; ;

CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT

John Shiko (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff," unless indicated otherwise) by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff has initiated this action to redress violations by Maurer & Scott, Inc. d/b/a Maurer & Scott Sales, Inc. of the American's with Disabilities Act, as amended ("ADA" – 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq.), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA" – 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 et seq.), and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act ("PHRA"). As a direct consequence of Defendant's unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

¹ Plaintiff's claim under the PHRA is referenced herein for notice purposes. He is required to wait 1 full year before initiating a lawsuit from date of dual-filing with the EEOC. Plaintiff must however file his lawsuit in advance of same because of the date of issuance of his federal right-to-sue-letter under the ADA and ADEA. Plaintiff's PHRA claims however will mirror identically his federal claims under the ADA and ADEA.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over the instant action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a)(4) because it arises under the laws of the United States and seeks redress for violations of federal laws.
- 3. This Court may properly assert personal jurisdiction over Defendant because its contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction over Defendant to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), venue is properly laid in this district because Defendant is deemed to reside where it is subjected to personal jurisdiction, rendering Defendant a resident of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
- 5. Plaintiff is proceeding herein under the ADA and ADEA after properly exhausting all administrative remedies with respect to such claims by timely filing a Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") and by filing the instant lawsuit within ninety ("90") days of receiving a notice of dismissal and/or right to sue letter from the EEOC.

PARTIES

- 6. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 7. Plaintiff is an adult individual, with an address as set forth in the caption.

- 8. Defendant Maurer & Scott, Inc. d/b/a Maurer & Scott Sales, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as "Defendant") is a corporation, located at the above-captioned address that offers blasting contractor services in Pennsylvania.
- 9. At all times relevant herein, Defendant acted by and through its agents, servants and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for the Defendant.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 10. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
 - 11. Plaintiff is a 52-year-old male.
- 12. In or about 2006, Plaintiff began employment with Defendant as a full-time Truck Driver/Laborer and continued to work for Defendant through in or about August of 2016 when he voluntarily resigned.
- 13. Plaintiff's job responsibilities were labor intensive and included tasks of lifting and hauling heavy materials on job sites, and then transporting them to different sites by means of truck.
- 14. Plaintiff has and continues to suffer from disabilities, including but not limited to medical conditions related to his neck and shoulders.
- 15. Throughout Plaintiff's employment with Defendant, Defendant was well apprised of Plaintiff's long-term health conditions, as Plaintiff had six different corrective surgeries, titanium rods and screws inserted into his spine, multiple injections, life threatening health problems, and endured numerous debilitative conditions related to his neck and shoulders for many years that limited his ability (at times) to work.

3

- 16. Even though Plaintiff suffered from these aforementioned serious medical conditions and limitations, Plaintiff continued to work and remain certified as a truck driver during his employment with Defendant, enjoyed a good work history throughout his entire tenure with Defendant, and lacked any formal discipline.
- 17. Because of his positive performance and good work history with Defendant, Plaintiff was assured by Jerome Kostantewicz (President, *hereinafter* "Kostantewicz") in or about August of 2016 that he would be welcomed back to Defendant and eligible for rehire at his convenience when and if he decided to return to work.
- 18. After temporarily resigning from Defendant (as discussed *supra*), Plaintiff diligently remained certified (kept his CDL and HazMat licenses up-to-date) and also remained capable of driving trucks.
- 19. Plaintiff was aware that numerous other drivers that took time away from Defendant, either for personal reasons (similar to Plaintiff's situation) or even under bad terms were often reinstated at Defendant. For instance, a blaster named Jared Beers was rehired six months after voluntarily quitting.
- 20. In or about October of 2016, Plaintiff followed the normal practice of reinstatement and reached out to Calvin Shellheimer (Superintendent and Hiring Manager, hereinafter "Shellheimer") directly. Instead of being reinstated, as Plaintiff expected because of his good work history, up-to-date certification, and personal assurance from Kostantewicz, Plaintiff was told he could not come back to work <u>specifically because of his neck problems</u> (even though Plaintiff's disabilities do not prevent him from being able to work).
- 21. Shocked by his denial and determined to be reinstated, as promised by Kostantewicz, Plaintiff continued to follow-up numerous times with Defendant's management.

For example, Plaintiff called Joe Totani (Manager, *hereinafter* "Totani") to inquire about being re-hired but was informed that "his [Totani's] hands were tied" and that he "would love to hire him [Plaintiff] back" but Kostantewicz and Shellheimer would not allow it.

- 22. In or about November of 2016, Plaintiff called John Melleck (Superintendent, hereinafter "Melleck") who worked at a different site from that of the one Plaintiff originally worked and told Plaintiff the same thing Totani had previously said (as discussed *supra*); that he "wished he could hire him" but Kostantewicz would not allow it.
- 23. In or about February of 2018, Defendant advertised online for the same position Plaintiff had previously worked for over ten years. Plaintiff applied online, received notification that his job application materials were transmitted, and even though he is more than qualified for the position and had no prior performance discipline in the past, Plaintiff did not receive an interview and was never contacted by Defendant.
- 24. To date, Plaintiff's attempts to be reinstated/re-hired with defendant have been ignored and he has not been permitted to return to work.
- 25. Upon information and belief, Defendant has continued to hire and re-hire truck drivers/laborers that are younger in age than Plaintiff, far less qualified, and even those that originally left on bad terms (unlike Plaintiff who left on good terms and with assurances that he could come back whenever he was ready to do so).
- 26. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers that he was denied employment/reinstatement because of his known, perceived, record of disabilities, and/or because of his age.

COUNT I

<u>Violations of the American's with Disabilities Act, as amended ("ADA")</u> (Actual/Perceived/Record of Disability Discrimination)

- 27. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 28. In or about August of 2016, Plaintiff voluntarily resigned from Defendant with the clear understanding that he would be rehired/reinstated once he was ready to return to work.
- 29. Even though Plaintiff suffered from various disabilities and limitations, he was able to perform his job duties throughout his tenure with Defendant and diligently remained certified and capable of driving trucks during his time away from Defendant.
- 30. Defendant was well aware of Plaintiff's serious health conditions, and even so, Kostantewicz personally assured him as President for Defendant that his job would be reinstated when he requested it.
- 31. Despite Kostantewicz's assurance, Plaintiff was told by Defendant's Hiring Manager Shellheimer explicitly that he could not come back to work specifically due to his aforementioned medical conditions.
- 32. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers that he was not rehired/reinstated by Defendant because of: (1) his known and/or perceived health problems; and/or (2) his record of impairment.
 - 33. These actions as aforesaid constitute unlawful discrimination and a failure to hire.

COUNT II

<u>Violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA")</u> (Age Discrimination & Failure to Hire)

34. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.

- 35. Plaintiff effectively performed his duties for Defendant for over ten years without any formal discipline or performance-related issues.
- 36. Upon information and belief, Plaintiff is aware of multiple drivers/laborers younger than him, with less experience and skill driving a truck who were rehired/reinstated with Defendant even if they left originally on bad terms (Plaintiff left on good terms).
- 37. Therefore, Plaintiff believes and avers that he was not rehired/reinstated with Defendant because of his advanced age.
- 38. These actions as aforesaid constitute unlawful discrimination and a failure to hire under the ADEA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

- A. Defendant is to promulgate and adhere to a policy prohibiting discrimination in the future against any employee(s);
- B. Defendant is to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff, and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendant's illegal actions, including but not limited to back pay, front pay, salary, pay increase, bonuses, insurance, benefits, training, promotions, reinstatement and seniority;
- C. Plaintiff is to be awarded punitive and/or liquidated damages, as permitted by applicable law, in an amount believed by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendant for their willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendant or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- D. Plaintiff is to be accorded other equitable and legal relief as the Court deems just, proper, and appropriate (including but not limited to damages for emotional distress, pain, suffering, and humiliation); and

7

E. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable attorney's fees as provided by applicable federal and state law.

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

By:

Date: June 21, 2018

Ari R. Karpf, Esq. 3331 Street Rd.

Two Greenwood Square, Suite 128

Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

8

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CIVIL ACTION

1010/1007			
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-4970 akarpf@karpf-law.co		···
Date	Attorney-at-law	Attorney for	
6/21/2018	4	Plaintiff	
(f) Standard Management	- Cases that do not fall into a	ny one of the other tracks.	(X)
commonly referred to 9	Cases that do not fall into traces complex and that need specified of this form for a detailed	ial of intense management by	
(d) Asbestos – Cases involence (d) Asbestos – Cases (d) Asbestos	ving claims for personal injur	y or property damage from	
• •		tration under Local Civil Rule 53.2	• ()
and Human Services de	requesting review of a decisi enying plaintiff Social Securit	y Benefits.	. ()
	brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2	•	()
	FOLLOWING CASE MANA		
plaintiff shall complete a C filing the complaint and ser side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant the plaintiff and all other pato which that defendant bel	ase Management Track Designer a copy on all defendants. (Something of the event that a defendant does shall, with its first appearance arties, a Case Management Trieves the case should be assigned.		time of reverse ng saic erve or
ırer & Scott, Inc. d/b/a Maur	ear & Scott Sales Inc	NO.	
. v .			

(Clv. 660) 10/02

Case 5:18-cv-02627-EGS Document 1 Filed 06/21/18 Page 10 of 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 3987 Upper Road, Shamokin, PA 17872					
Address of Defendant: 122 Thomas Street, Coopersburg, PA 18036					
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendant's place of business					
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number: Judge: Date Terminated:					
Civil cases are deemed related when Yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year Yes No X previously terminated action in this court?					
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit Yes No X pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court?					
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier No X numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court?					
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights Yes No X					
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is / is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.					
DATE: 6/21/2018 ARK2484 / 91538 Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)					
Austriey-di-Law / 110 Se I manug					
CIVIL: (Place a √ in one category only)					
A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:					
☐ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts ☐ 2. FELA ☐ 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts ☐ 2. Airplane Personal Injury					
3. Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. Assault, Defamation					
4. Antitrust 4. Marine Personal Injury					
4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Labor-Management Relations 6. Other Personal Injury 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify):					
4. Antitrust 5. Patent 6. Labor-Management Relations 7. Civil Rights 7. Products Liability 8. Products Liability 9. Products Liability Ashestos					
5. Patent 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury					
9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 9. All other Diversity Cases (Please specify):					
9. Securities Act(s) Cases					
9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify):					
9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases					
9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) I, Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:					
9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)					
9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) I, Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case					
9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) I, Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: X Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs: Relief other than monetary damages is sought. ARK2484/91538					
9. Securities Act(s) Cases 10. Social Security Review Cases 11. All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify): ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.) I, Ari R. Karpf , counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify: X Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs: Relief other than monetary damages is sought.					

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

purpose of initiating the civil de	ocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCT	TONS ON NEXT PAGE O	F THIS FO.	RM.)	-		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS			
SHIKO, JOHN				MARUER & SCOT	ΓΤ, INC. d/b/a MAURI	ER & SCOTT SALES, INC.	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Northumberland (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.			
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, 2	Address, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Known)			
Karpf, Karpf & Cerutti, I Suite 128, Bensalem, PA	P.C.; 3331 Street Road	l, Two Greenwood	Square law.com	,)			
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in Or	ne Box Only)	m. cı	TIZENSHIP OF PI (For Diversity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif f and One Box for Defendant)	
1 U.S. Government X 3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citiz	PT	IF DEF I 1 Incorporated or Pri of Business In	PTF DEF incipal Place 4 4		
2 U.S. Government Defendant			Citiz	en of Another State	2 2 Incorporated and F of Business In	Principal Place 5 5 n Another State	
				en or Subject of a reign Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	6 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT						of Suit Code Descriptions.	
GONTRACT - :	-			DREETURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	375 False Claims Act	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	PERSONAL INJUR 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical		25 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 90 Other	422 Appeal 28 USC 158 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS	376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) 0 400 State Reapportionment	
150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Slander ' 330 Federal Employers' Liability ' 340 Marine	Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product			820 Copyrights 830 Patent 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application	430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
(Excludes Veterans)	345 Marine Product	Liability	TV	LABOR	840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY	Corrupt Organizations 3 480 Consumer Credit	
153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	PERSONAL PROPER 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage Product Liability	0 71 0 72 0 73	EABOR 10 Fair Labor Standards Act 20 Labor/Management Relations 40 Railway Labor Act 1 Family and Medical Leave Act	' 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) ' 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI ' 865 RSI (405(g))	490 Cable/Sat TV 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 893 Environmental Matters 895 Freedom of Information	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVILRIGHTS	PRISONER PER HUIO		00 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SULTS		
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations X 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Oth 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of	0 40	21 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION 52 Naturalization Application 55 Other Immigration Actions	870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	896 Arbitration 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
		Confinement			<u> </u>		
		Remanded from Appeilate Court			erred from 0 6 Multidis er District Litigation Transfe	on - Litigation -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	ON ADA (42USC121 Brief description of ca	01); ADEA (29U)	SC621)	Do not cite jurisdictional stati	utes unless diversity):		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		IS A CLASS ACTIO		DEMAND S	CHECK YES on JURY DEMAN	ly if demanded in complaint: D: X Yes 'No	
VIII. RELATED CASS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER _		
DATE 6/21/2018		SIGNATURE OF AT	ORNEY	OF RECORD			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	· · · · · ·						
RECEIPT# A	MOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE.	MAG. J	UDGE	

Print

Save As...

Reset